DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 799 EC 071 641

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | A Study of the Visually Impaired Young People of Kansas and a Review of Educational Services. |
| INSTITUTION | Kansas State Dept. of Education, Topeka.; Kansas State Dept. of Social and Rehabilitation Services, Topeka. |
| PUB DATE | Jul 74 |
| NOTE | 69p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE |
| DESCRIPTORS | Blind; Educational Needs; Educational Planning; *Educational Programs; Exceptional Child Education; Interagency Cooperation; Multiply Handicapped; Partially Sighted; Public Schools; Residential Care; State Schools; *State Surveys; *Statistical Data; *Visually Handicapped |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Kansas |

ABSTRACT

The report of a 1974 cooperative study focuses on current educational service delivery for 708 visually impaired (VI) Kansans (up to 21 years old). Provided is a summary of data from unified school districts (USDs), state services for the blind (SFB), and institutions on such topics as age, sex, geographic distribution, handicapping conditions, behavioral characteristics, academic achievement, self-care skills, and educational programs. Described are relevant legal provisions; the current extent of residential and home care, the rationale for residential care; and the roles of the USDs, the SFB, and three of the residential care institutions in providing service to VI individuals with 12 selected characteristics (such as handicapping condition and degree of dependence). Educational and training programs offered to VI home based and residential populations are also analyzed. Among the conclusions cited are that 37 percent of the preschool Ss have no program, that 19 percent have home programs, and that 18 percent have readiness programs. Attention is given to general recommendations in such areas as needs analysis and program development and to additional recommendations by a Vision Task Force Committee in such areas as individualized programs structured within a cascade system. Also included are a sample questionnaire, a brief discussion of the normalization principle and the cascade system, and detailed examples of cross tabulation data analyses. (LH)

ED102799

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# A Study of the Visually Impaired Young People of Kansas and a Review of Educational Services

July 1974

EC 071 641

Special Committee for Study
of the
Visually Impaired Young People
of Kansas

## FOREWORD

The findings and recommendations in this study came from many hours of professional input from the Kansas State Department of Education, the Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped, Kansas Neurological Institute, State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, the Kansas Association for the Blind, and the Budget Division of the State Department of Administration.

We appreciate the cooperation especially of:

*Elaine Crowther, Supervisor of Social Services, Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped Section, State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, State Office Building, 6th Floor, Topeka, Kansas 66612

*Ruth Fine, Education Program Specialist, Preschool for the Visually Impaired, Special Education Section, Division of Instruction, State Department of Education, 120 East 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas, 66612

*Jayne Frost, Supervisor of Social Services, Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped Section, State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, State Office Building, 6th Floor, Topeka, Kansas 66612

*Don Herbel, Education Program Specialist, Visually Impaired, Special Education Section, Division of Instruction, State Department of Education, 120 East 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas 66612

*Harold Hodges, Principal, Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped, 1100 State Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66102

*Georgia Layton, Member, Education Committee, Kansas Association for the Blind, 925 Connecticut, Lawrence, Kansas 66044

*Burton Lewis, Superintendent, Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped, 1100 State Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66102

Donna Long, Secretary, Division of Instruction, State Department of Education, 120 East 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas 66612

*L.S. Julie Marrin, Director of Education, Kansas Neurological Institute, 3107 West 21st, Topeka, Kansas 66604

James Marshall, Director, Special Education Section, Division of Instruction, State Department of Education, 120 East 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas 66612

*James Nezol, Education Program Specialist, Visually Impaired, Special Education Section, Division of Instruction, State Department of Education, 120 East 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas 66612

Rick Pfeiffer, Social Worker, Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped, State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, State Office Building, 6th Floor, Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dennis Popp, Coordinator, Mental Retardation-Developmental Disabilities Services, Division of Mental Health and Retardation Services, State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, State Office Building, 5th Floor, Topeka, Kansas 66612

Bill Preston, Supervisor of Direct Services, Children, Youth, and Their Families Section, Division of Social Services, State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, State Office Building, 6th Floor, Topeka, Kansas 66612

Jack Pulliam, Coordinator of Children's Services, Division of Mental Health and Retardation Services, State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, State Office Building, 5th Floor, Topeka, Kansas 66612

*Linda Ross, Director of Special Services, Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped, 1100 State Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66102

*Esther Taylor, Chairman, Education Committee, Kansas Association for the Blind, 7850 Freeman Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66612

We are also indebted to Mr. Verlyn Leiker, Budget Division, State Department of Administration, who provided the excellent guidance and structure for the study.

We are grateful to Mr. Warren Bell, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Instruction, Kansas State Department of Education, who coordinated the personnel involved in producing the research concerned with the visually handicapped children in Kansas. Dr. Lawrence Casto, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Development, and Dr. Ann Harrison, Specialist, Planning, Research, and Evaluation Section, are to be commended for their assistance in the computer programming and data analysis associated with the research.

The study was made possible by both state and federal funds.

*Vision Task Force Committee Members

CONTENTS


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| The Study | 1 |
| The New Law | 2 |
| The Visually Impaired Young People of Kansas | 4 |
| The Extent of Residential Care and Home Care at Present | 5 |
| The Reasons and Justification for Residential Care | 8 |
| The Roles of the Various Agencies and Residential Care Settings — An Analysis of Their Clients | 15 |
| The Roles of the Various Agencies and Residential Care Settings — An Analysis of Their Educational Programs | 19 |
| Recommendations | 23 |
| Questionnaire | 28 |
| Attachments | 33 |

## THE STUDY

The present study of the visually impaired young people of Kansas is the result of a larger effort initiated by the Kansas State Board of Education and the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (formerly the Department of Social Welfare).

The larger effort is aimed at gaining more information about, and a better understanding of, the present status of the educational programs for all handicapped young Kansans. This study focuses only on the visually impaired or visually handicapped.

The study comes at time when a particular approach to delivering educational services to the handicapped is becoming recognized. This particular approach is based on the concept of "normalization." The normalization concept stresses that a handicapped child should be well anchored and well integrated into his own home, community, and neighborhood school and to the maximum degree possible. This concept of normalization, in turn, implies a "cascade system" which has a goal of providing services (educational) that are the least "special" as possible for the adequate education of the child. A more detailed handling of normalization and the cascade system can be found in the attachment section of this report.

An additional consideration that emerged after the study was initiated . . . but a consideration that needs to be inserted here . . . was the passage of a new piece of legislation that will affect planning and the delivery of educational services not only for the visually impaired, but as well, for all other school age children who require special education efforts and programs. The recommendation of the present study should conform in spirit and substance with this new law.

## THE NEW LAW

The 1974 legislative session produced a significant piece of legislation that will affect the school aged visually impaired and should be considered here (at least briefly). The bill, H.B. 1672 (as amended by S.B. 1024), amends and repeals the laws relating to special education in article 9 of Chapter 72 of the Kansas Statutes Annotated. The bill provides a comprehensive revision and recodification of the special education law. The principle changes are listed below:

1. A mandate as of July 1, 1979, that all boards of education provide approvable special education services for all exceptional children in the school district. (The present July 1, 1974, mandate for programs for the developmentally disabled is not changed.);
2. a requirement that the State Board of Education prepare, adopt, and administer a comprehensive state plan, including standards and criteria, for special education services;
3. the inclusion within the purview of the state plan, the special education programs of the state institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services and the Kansas State School for the Deaf and Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped. (These two institutions are under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education.);
4. a provision for a due process hearing at the school district level concerning any assignment, reassignment, or exclusion of a child with regard to special education services;
5. a requirement that all new rules and regulations adopted by the State Board pertaining to special education be submitted to the legislature during each regular session, to be modified, approved, or disapproved;
6. the combination of the three existing state categorical aid programs for special education into a single program, and revision of the method of distributing categorical funds;
7. the creation of a nine-member state advisory council for special education to be appointed by the State Board of Education for terms of three years;
8. the substitution of the comprehensive term "exceptional children" for the several different terms presently in law that define specific categories of exceptionality. Such children would be school age, as determined in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by the State Board;

9. the recognition in the categorical state aid distribution plan of paraprofessionals who, in accord with State Board standards, assist certificated teachers in the instruction of exceptional children; and

10. a provision that special education cooperative agreements be for a term of not less than three years and not more than five years. (Under prior law, there were no time limitations with respect to these agreements.)

Sections of the new law that are particularly relevant to the present study are seen in points (1), (2), (3), (4), and (8). The law indicates that all USD's must provide approvable services for all exceptional children (including the visually impaired), that the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) must develop and administer a plan (including standards for service), that all the appropriate institutions must be included in the plan, that there are provisions for a hearing whenever a USD attempts to assign or exclude a child from special education services, and that the law refers to only school age children (ages to be determined by rules and regulations of the State Board of Education and reviewed by the legislature). And, of course, the provision for additional monies in the later bill and the recognition of the use of paraprofessionals assisting special education teachers is bound to have impact.

The new law is basically consistent with the normalization concept and will no doubt put both additional pressure on the 309 unified school districts of Kansas to educate their own whenever possible.

## THE *VISUALLY IMPAIRED YOUNG PEOPLE OF KANSAS

The present study is concerned not only with the visually impaired young people of Kansas but as well with the present educational efforts and programs associated with these visually impaired young people in Kansas. And although the study does provide a better picture of what is going on in Kansas in this area, it does have a number of limitation that came about as a result of certain shortcomings in research techniques (see page 27).

In order to better understand both what is now going on and what is needed, data was collected in 1973 on a total of 708 individuals with visual impairments. . The data was collected using mailed out questionnaires (see attachments). Completed questionnaires were received from all 309 Unified School Districts (USD's) of Kansas, the Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped (SFB), the Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped (KSSVH), the Kansas Neurological Institute (KNI), Parsons State Hospital and Training School (Parsons), Winfield State Hospital (Winfield), and the Institute of Logopedics (IL) at Wichita. No accurate estimate of the number of young people with visual impairments who were not included in the study is possible from the results of this study. There is a good probability, however, that most of the young people (generally 21 and under) in Kansas who do have visual impairments touch on at least one of these agencies. Consequently, it is felt that most of the group under study are included in the study, and as a result much can be learned from the data collected and analyzed here.

*For the purpose of this report, the terms "visually handicapped" or "visually impaired" refers to children who have no vision or whose visual impairments after correction result in educational handicaps requiring special provisions for maximal educational achievement. Such children's eye conditions generally fall within one of the following categories:

1. Visual acuity of 20/70 or poorer in the better eye after correction.
2. Constricted visual field or impaired field of vision.
3. An eye condition or disorder diagnosed by an eye specialist as requiring special provisions either on a temporary or long-term basis.
4. Multiple-handicapping conditions including a visual problem.

## THE EXTENT OF RESIDENTIAL CARE AND HOME CARE AT PRESENT

The majority of the visually impaired young people of Kansas are presently living at home (61%) and most of these living at home (41%) are serviced either by the regular school system (USD's—special education) or by the Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped (20%) or both. The data received from the State Hospital at Parsons and the Institute of Logopedics at Wichita indicates that these two institutions house and service very few (slightly over 1%) of the visually impaired school age children of Kansas. KSSVH provides a home and services to 13% of the population under study while KNI and the State Hospital at Winfield house and service 18% and 7% of the population. Below is a table indicating the location of and servicing agency of the 708 identified visually impaired Kansas young people. Also please see the map on page 4 for home counties of the visually impaired.

Table No. 1

| Location of Kansas Visually Impaired Young People | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *USD's | *SFB | KNI | KSSVH | Winfield | Parsons | I.L. |
| 41%(home)<br>N=289 | 20%(home)<br>N=143 | 18%<br>N=127 | 13%<br>N=94 | 7%<br>N=48 | 1%<br>N=4 | 1%<br>N=3 |

* For purposes of obtaining an unduplicated count of visually impaired youngsters, school aged children were reported on by USD personnel and not by the SFB agency.

Conclusions:

1. Based on the figures presented in Table No. 1, it is apparent that the majority (61%) of the population under study lives at home and is serviced by either the public school system or the Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped or both.

   The nature of this majority, the nature and extent of the services they receive, and the nature of the roles that these two separate providers of services play . . . will be examined later. Also we should point out that it is likely that the children overlooked in this study, if any, probably fall into the home based group.

2. Based on the figures in Table No. 1 it appears that, of the 5 residential settings studied, two (Parsons State Hospital and Training Center and the Institute of Logopedics) provide services to a very small number (7) and proportion (1%) of this population. Consequently, they will not be considered a significant part of the overall delivery system and will be dropped from further analyses.

   Both the unique and common aspects of the individuals served by these remaining 3 residential settings as well as the uniqueness of the services provided by these three will be examined later in this report.

3. Based on the results of plotting the home counties of the identified visually impaired (see page 4), it can be concluded that although the density of the distribution of the visually handicapped generally follows the overall population density distribution of the state, it is obvious that the visually impaired come from all parts of the state.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# DISTRIBUTION OF HOME COUNTIES OF VISUALLY IMPAIRED YOUNG PEOPLE

## KANSAS



## THE REASONS AND JUSTIFICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL CARE

In order to begin to better understand the need or justification for residential care of a visually impaired young person, a number of possible psychological, medical and maintenance characteristics were extracted from the questionnaire data and used as a criterion for possible residential placement. These variables have to do with psychological characteristics (e.g., aggressiveness, disturbed), mental ability (very low intellectual level of functioning), medical problems (e.g., frequent seizures), personal maintenance problems (totally dependent on others for eating, dressing, or toilet) and rejection in the home or community. *A complete list is footnoted below. We should point out however, that the decision to place an individual in a residential setting is sometimes based on other types of considerations, such as other management problems, discipline, lack of interest, and lack of available health or special education resources in the local area. This criterion for possible placement in a residential setting is based strictly on a need for very close care and not just an absence of local special education services.

* Listed as having one or more of the following characteristics: Uncontrolled Grand Mal (2%), Rarely or Never Normal (11%), Usually Disturbed (12%), Frequently Physically Aggressive to Self (3%), Frequently Physically Aggressive to Others (3%), Frequently Physically Aggressive to Objects (2%), Frequently Verbally Aggressive (5%), Frequently Hyperactive (4%), Frequently Passive (13%), Frequently Withdrawn (10%), Profound (24%) or Severe (7%) Mental Retardation, Totally Dependent—Dressing (20%), Totally Dependent—Eating (17%), Totally Dependent—Toilet (18%), or Overt Rejection at Home (3%).

Conclusions:

4. A ready conclusion that derives from the percentages listed above is that compared to the normal population, the visually impaired young people (including the multi-handicapped visually impaired) of Kansas display a higher probability of being passive or withdrawn, and a very large proportion of those on which data was available are labelled as intellectually borderline or retarded to some degree (60%). They do differ from the normal population and the normal school population and probably do need special consideration and/or care for characteristics beyond their visual impairments.

15/16

Following the above criterion, the total population was analyzed and it was found that a full 51% of the total population under study came under this criterion by virtue of displaying (or being victim to) one or more of the characteristics. You will recall, however, that only 39% of the population was presently in residential care settings. Also we should add that when the question of proper placement was asked of the home based young people 9 were indicated as being better placed in a residential setting (1 as better placed in a residential setting for the mentally retarded and 8 as better placed in a residential setting for the visually impaired) while only 2 individuals in residential settings were identified by agency personnel as being better placed at home.

However, when one examines the characteristics of the young people in the residential settings and the characteristics of the home based young people, the results raise some questions about placement decisions based on these care needs. The following table should be of interest.

Table No. 2

| Percent of Total in Each Location that Meets One or More of the Possible Criteria for Residential Care | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| USD's (home) | SFB (home) | KSSVH | KNI | Winfield |
| 42%(120) | 19%(26) | 39%(37) | 95%(121) | 100%(48) |

Again, keep in mind that the criterion for placing an individual in a residential care setting (one or more of the selected psychological, mental, medical, maintenance, or rejection characteristics) was an extremely liberal one and that obviously any of these conditions that could be treated, handled or cared for at home or in the local community would (in those cases) most likely eliminate the need for residential care.

But quite apart from what might serve as justification for residential care is the question of what is actually being done. In the table above it is apparent that the bulk of the population at KNI (95%) and at Winfield (100%) obviously meet the very liberal criterion in one way or another. Further examination of the specific characteristics of the individuals in these institutions will be undertaken later but the general point here is that the decision to place in a residential care setting could be justified in almost all cases. Note, however, that on the surface and according to this very

general criterion; roughly the same proportions can be observed in the population serviced by the USD's and the KSSVH. A somewhat smaller proportion is observed in the SFB population (to jump ahead however we should point out that 25% of the studied SFB population is made up of pre-school aged children who are generally dependent* and protected and 67% are 15 or older and looking for employment). Of course, this needs to be examined more closely but it should indicate that some of the problems that might be cited by some as justification for placement in a residential care setting are in some cases (USD's) being taken care of in the community or at home.

The extent of the practice of placing a young person in a residential setting because of lack of appropriate special education services in their home area can only be approximated by the present study but it needs to be examined in as much as possible and particularly for KSSVH.

When one examines the home counties of those placed at KSSVH (located in Wyandotte County) it becomes apparent that at least 36% of the young people are themselves from Wyandotte County and are well within driving distance from the Shawnee Mission USD and the Kansas City USD, both of which have special education programs for the visually handicapped (see maps on page 8 and 9). Another approximate 15% came from counties such as Sedgwick, Ford and Shawnee where again there are already special education programs for the visually impaired in progress in the USD's or within close proximity. In summary, about 50% of the population of KSSVH comes from a county where there is a USD with a special education program for the visually handicapped already in progress. If district boundries were not a problem, or a problem that could be easily resolved, then some resources at least are close to home for some of those at KSSVH.

One can also observe that future increases in the availability of special education resources within the local USD's will quite likely reduce the practice of placing young people in residential settings (if the motive for the decision had to do with the need for appropriate special education resources).

* 2 years old and younger were removed from "dependency" part of criterion for placement in residential care settings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# HOME COUNTIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE AT KANSAS STATE SCHOOL FOR THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED




19120

11 U.S.D.'S WITH SPECIAL ED PROGRAMS FOR VISUALLY HANDICAPPED

BEST COPY AVAILABLE




28/12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## THE INSTITUTIONS THAT SERVE THE VISUALLY IMPAIRED



Conclusions:

5. Clearly the number of placements in residential care settings we have in Kansas could be justified in many cases (because of medical, psychological, and social variables) and most easily for KNI and Winfield State Hospital. Also, a surface examination of the children in the USD's and KSSVH incidates a much lower but a similar proportion of children qualifying under a liberal criterion for residential care for both the USD's and KSSVH.

6. Conditions that might justify residential care placement for some are in a home in almost half (42%) of the instances where the USD's are servicing the visually impaired child (see Table No. 2 page 9).

7. KSSVH may be unnecessarily duplicating (or vice versa) the programs in its own county, neighboring counties, and counties with existing programs for the visually impaired. However, the quality of the programs cannot be compared without further study. Their service load is definitely skewed to their own geographic area (however, some families may have moved to that area to be close to KSSVH).

8. Based on an inspection of the map on which the 11 Special Education programs (USD's) are plotted, there are clearly no special education programs for the visually impaired in the north central and northwestern areas of Kansas.

9. Based on an inspection of the map on which the residential settings are plotted, it can be concluded that there are no residential settings that could serve the visually impaired in north, west, and central Kansas.

## THE ROLES OF THE VARIOUS AGENCIES AND RESIDENTIAL CARE SETTINGS
## – AN ANALYSIS OF THEIR CLIENTS –

An examination of certain aspects of the data from the survey needs to be made in order to begin to understand the uniqueness of the roles of the two types of agencies that service the home based visually handicapped. First let us look at a comparison of the number of individuals in each of several age groups of those serviced by the USD's and SFB.

Table No. 3

| | AGE | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 and under | 6 – 11 | 12 – 14 | 15 – 18 | 19 and older |
| USD's | 28 | 130 | 56 | 57 | 3 |
| SFB | 47 | * 0 | * 0 | 31 | 64 |

Conclusions: 10. The results in Table No. 3 reflect that at present there is at least a somewhat unique role for the two agencies servicing the home based visually impaired. SFB primarily services pre-school aged children and young people about 15 years of age and older (Vocational Rehabilitation Program) . . . and the USD's primarily service school age young people (who are in school). Some extension into pre-school by the USD's is apparent and some extension into the 19 and older group is also suggested. Also, SFB is providing supplemental educational services to school aged children that are being primarily serviced by the USD's . . . although it doesn't show in the table. Again, however the uniqueness is apparent.

Now, let us examine the two types of agencies that service the home based visually handicapped along with the three residential settings. The examination and comparison will be centered around twelve selected characteristics.

* In order to obtain an unduplicated count, SFB did not report on school aged children (5 to 15) whose educational needs were being primarily met by USD's.

Table No. 4

| Selected Characteristics of the Visually Impaired Populations Serviced by the Agencies and Residential Settings | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | USD's | SFB | KSSVH | KNI | Winfield |
| Legally Blind | 39% | 96% | 90% | 59% | 65% |
| No Appreciable Loss in Hearing | 84% | 82% | 85% | 60% | 59% |
| Subject to Seizures | 2% | 4% | 10% | 50% | 65% |
| Motor Difficulties | 24% | 41% | 12% | 66% | 98% |
| Requires Direct Medical Supervision | 9% | 19% | 23% | 45% | 83% |
| Sometimes or Usually Disturbed | 29% | 27% | 34% | 58% | 82% |
| Physically Aggressive to Self | 2% | 2% | 0% | 7% | 8% |
| Physically Aggressive to Others | 2% | 2% | 0% | 10% | 0% |
| Subnormal IQ | 38% | 14% | 46% | 99% | 100% |
| Totally Dependent—Dressing | 9% | 1% | 4% | 40% | 89% |
| Totally Dependent—Eating | 6% | 1% | 4% | 37% | 83% |
| Totally Dependent—Toilet | 7% | 3% | 4% | 34% | 87% |
| Median Age | 11 | bimodal | 13 | 15 | 10 |

Conclusion 11: An obvious conclusion from the comparisons in Table No. 4 is that the part of the total population under study that is presently at Winfield appears to be clearly unique in its overwhelmingly common mental, medical, psychological, and maintenance problems. The visual impairment problem is clearly compounded by other serious and handicapping problems.

Conclusion 12: Likewise, from Table No. 4 it can be seen that although the population at KNI also stands out from the populations of the other institution (KSSVH) and the home based population; it is similar to Winfield in dealing with the retarded exclusively (or almost so) . . . but it is different from Winfield in the lesser extent of other problems (medical, psychological, and maintenance characteristics).

13. As displayed by Table No. 4, it appears as though the populations served by the USD's and by SFB are distinguishable along certain characteristics in addition to age (Table No. 3). First, fewer of those in the USD's are legally blind as compared to the higher figure for SFB. Next, the SFB population is somewhat more characterized by people with motor (movement) difficulties and need for direct medical supervision than are those attending the schools. Finally, SFB is servicing fewer of those with subnormal I.Q.'s than are the USD's. Overall, there appears to be a general uniqueness in who is being served by SFB and the USD's and in what way (care vs. education).

14. Based on the figures in Table No. 4, it is clearly only a matter of extensiveness in a single dimension (legally blind/acuity) that distinguishes the groups served by KSSVH and the USD's. Here, the only clear difference is in the percentage who are considered "legally blind." This may or may not be a very distinct difference in terms of the part of the population served and needs to be examined more closely. It should be mentioned, however, that special education services are not completely related to legal blindness. Below are some data from the questionnaire that may be relevant.

Table No. 5

| Acuity | USD's | KSSVH |
|---|---|---|
| Better than 20/200 | 4.4% | 14% |
| 20/200 | 15% | 16% |
| Worse than 20/200 | 29.4% | 7% |
| Can't Be Tested | 7% | 2% |
| No Vision | 6% | 35% |
| Light Perception Only | 2% | 4% |
| Counts Fingers Only | .4% | 1% |
| No Information | 22% | 10% |

Table No. 6

| Type of Problem | USD's | KSSVH |
|---|---|---|
| Congenital Cataracts | 17% | 7% |
| Congenital Glancoma | 4% | 3% |
| Retinoblastoma | 3% | 6% |
| RLF | 6% | 25% |
| Nystagmus | 30% | 14% |
| Optic Nerve Atrophy | 7% | 22% |
| Myopia | 23% | 7% |
| Injury | 3% | 3% |
| Other | 42% | 46% |

Conclusion 15: Based on several comparisons (tables 2, 4, 5 and 6) presented in this report, there does appear to be a very close resemblance in the segments of the total population of visually impaired Kansas young people that are being served by the USD's and by KSSVH. These two do not appear significantly unique in terms of the individuals they serve except perhaps in degree (acuity).

## THE ROLES OF THE VARIOUS AGENCIES AND RESIDENTIAL CARE SETTINGS – AN ANALYSIS OF THEIR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS –

Below is an analysis of the average number of hours in a structured educational program or training that are received by indjviduals involved across all the various types of education programs offered or supported (SFB) by the agencies and residential care settings.

Table No. 7

| Average Weekly Hours in Structured Educational Program or Training | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | USD's** | KSSVH** | KNI** | Winfield** | SFB** |
| None* | 12% | 0% | 44% | 74% | 58% |
| 1–5 | 11% | 0% | 10% | 2% | 3% |
| 6–10 | 3% | 3% | 9% | 9% | 0% |
| 11–15 | 3% | 0% | 8% | 6% | 0% |
| 16–20 | 0% | 0% | 9% | 4% | 0% |
| 21–25 | 4% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% |
| 26–30 | 46% | 94% | 7% | 2% | 0% |
| 31–35 | 18% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% |
| 36–40 | 1% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 39% |
| 41 & Over | 0% | 3% | 2% | 0% | 0% |

* 18% of those receiving "none" are pre-schoolers 5 years of age and under. 17% of those in the 1–5 group are pre-schoolers, 22% in the 6–10, 17% in the 11–15, and 7% in the 16–20 are pre-school age. **May only include special education teacher or special materials.

Conclusion 16: Based on the analysis in Table No. 7, it appears as though the two agencies serving the home based population under study (SFB and the USD's) are relatively unique in respect to educational programming. The USD's appear to be more committed to academic educational offerings (although 12% indicated none), while SFB provides no education for 58% of their visually impaired clients and supports very extensive education training for their clients who cannot attend school, have graduated, or have dropped out of the public school programs.

17. From Table No. 7, and based on the data from this study, it can be concluded that the Winfield State Hospital is generally not involving the bulk (74%) of their visually impaired young people in

any traditional education programs or training. They are apparently oriented primarily to maintenance and their visually impaired young people participate in very few structured educational or training programs.

18: KSSVH appears (from the data in Table No. 7) to have a fairly standardized length program for their clients. The effort (26-30) hours per week appears to be a relatively heavy involvement in education and training of the visually impaired as compared with the two other residential settings (KNI and Winfield).

Next, and below, is an analysis of the extent of involvement of visually impaired young people by type of educational program offered by the different agencies and residential care settings.

Table No. 8

Extent of Involvement of Served Group in Types of Present Educational Program

| Program Offered | USD's | KSSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None* | 3% | 1% | 47% | 74% | 22% |
| Home Program | 2% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 10% |
| Readiness | 5% | 16% | 20% | 0% | 2% |
| Academic | 77% | 68% | 14% | 0% | 35% |
| Sheltered Workshop | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 12% |
| Vocational | 0% | 15% | 10% | 0% | 2% |
| Other | 10% | 0% | 8% | 26% | 17% |

* 28% of all children receiving "none" are pre-school age. 81% of those in the home program are pre-schoolers, 22% of those in Readiness, 2% in Academic, and 11% in Other are pre-school age.

Conclusion 19: From the figures in Table No. 8, one can easily conclude that Winfield State Hospital is not educating or training their visually impaired young people in any of the types of programs asked about in this study.

Conclusion 20: The figures in Table No. 8 indicate that the programs at KSSVH and in the USD's are very similar but KSSVH is somewhat more heavily involved in the readiness and vocational areas than is characteristic of the USD's. There is more evidence of similarity in program type offering than differences.

21: SFB appears, from the data figures to be relatively more concerned with the use of home programs and sheltered workshops than either the USD's or the KSSVH and relatively less concerned with academic education. This may be because of the more extensive number of individuals with motor (movement) difficulties who might have trouble attending schools and the fact that more individuals that need direct medical supervision are serviced by SFB.

22: No conclusions about the relative quality of the various programs at the residential care settings or of the various programs provided by the agencies are possible from data collected by this study. Some examination of the adequacy of declared "programs," and an inventory of specific resources and objectives of each program is needed.

Because an individual's age is a significant consideration in providing educational programs and training, the table below is presented outlining the age distribution (by groupings) of individuals served by each agency and residential care setting. Generally, it is recognized that educational efforts at the very early ages are particularly important.

Table No. 9

| | AGE | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 and under | 6–11 | 12–14 | 15–18 | 19 and older |
| USD's | 28 | 130 | 56 | 57 | 3 |
| KSSVH | 5 | 30 | 25 | 26 | 8 |
| KNI | 7 | 29 | 24 | 37 | 32 |
| SFB | 47 | 0* | 0* | 31 | 64 |
| Winfield | 7 | 18 | 10 | 11 | 2 |
| Total | 99(15%) | 208(29%) | 115(17%) | 163(23%) | 109(17%) |

Conclusion 23: Data in Table No. 9 reveals that Winfield services a number of individuals in the younger age categories but from previous analysis it was indicated that no traditional educational or training programs are offered by Winfield.

Table No. 10

| Analysis of Pre-school Age | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program Type | | | | | | |
| None | Home Program | Readiness | Academic | Sheltered Workshop | Vocational | Other |
| 37% | 19% | 18% | 10% | 0 | 0 | 16% |

Conclusion 24: Data in Table No. 10 indicates what is being done in the way of providing pre-school education or training for the visually impaired young people of Kansas.

* There are individuals being serviced by SFB but the primary responsibility for their education is with the USD's and only supplemental services are provided by SFB.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that additional research be initiated that would allow a more specific and individualized needs analysis and as well, an evaluation of the nature and quality of all the present programs for the visually impaired in the state. This would include all agencies and institutions and would be an inventory of all types of courses, all types of personnel and their competence, all equipment, and program capabilities for various types of impairments. The inventory analyses could then be matched against the more specific needs analysis based on individual plans for the visually impaired.

2. It is recommended that individualized education programs based on professionally developed guidelines and a professional diagnosis be developed for each and every visually handicapped child in the state and that they, in the future, be developed as early as is possible (pre-school) and that they combine not only the needs related to education but also to the other handicapping characteristics that seem to frequently accompany visual impairedness (based on conclusion No. 4).

3. It is recommended that appropriate and high quality services and educational programs for the visually impaired be provided as close to the child's home as is possible. Whenever possible the problem should be diagnosed, an individual plan developed, and an educational program be provided within the child's own USD. When that is not possible, the efforts should be within a multi-district regional area, and only when this is not possible should the services and programs of a residential setting serving the entire state be utilized. (This general recommendation is based on (1) the emerging philosophy of delivering service, (2) the new law and (3) the data collected in this study that indicates a geographic maldistribution of services within the state.)

4. It is recommended that adequate programs be developed in the USD's that presently do not have educational programs for the visually impaired. These programs should either be comprehensive or a part of a special education cooperative (multi-district program) that is comprehensive.

5. It is recommended that special efforts be made to initiate programs in USD's in the Northern, Western, and North Central counties of Kansas.

6. It is recommended that Winfield State Hospital be used only in such cases where visual impairment is only a part of a cluster of very serious multiple handicaps (including very low level intellectual functioning) that render a child unable to progress in developmental areas other than simple socialization and self-maintenance. Also that children in the younger age grouping not be placed (whenever possible) at Winfield.

7. It is recommended that KNI be considered as the appropriate institution for the younger (including pre-schoolers and even the new born) mentally retarded visually impaired whenever residential care is needed.

8. It is recommended that additional educational programs for the visually handicapped be supported at KNI.

9. It is recommended that there be two plans for the use of KSSVH. The first plan would be an interim plan that recognizes that it will take some time to set up an adequate and coordinated delivery system for the visually impaired in the USD's. This plan should cover the years 1974 to 1979 (the deadline year under the new law) and adequate support should be provided to accomplish this plan.

   The second plan would be developed during the interim period and be based on the more detailed study of individualized educational and supportive needs that emerge from the plans and analyses and the progress of the USD's. The use of KSSVH would be consistent with the new law and with the suggested guidelines for providing services spelled out in recommendation number 3.

10. It is recommended that this study and any future study provide the basis for a comprehensive state plan for the visually impaired and that that plan should stress the central coordination of all state resources, the elimination of any unnecessary duplication, the use of professionally developed program standards, maximum educational efforts at the earliest possible age, serious attempts to work with the so called "uneducatables," and the use of a concept of "overriding disability" for placement when needed.

11. It is recommended that additional efforts be made to insure that normalization is optimized.

## ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE VISION TASK FORCE COMMITTEE

The previous report and recommendations were more strictly based on the data gathered but do not fully reflect the total conclusions of the Task Force. The following additional recommendations submitted are based on the professional judgment and consunsus of the Vision Task Force following the analysis of the results and is included here for consideration.

1. It is recommended that the position in the Special Education Section, Program Director for the Visually Handicapped, under the Kansas State Department of Education, assume the major responsibility for the development of educational programs for the visually handicapped, to recommend standards to the Board of Education and carry the responsibility for evaluating the progress of each visually handicapped child in all state supported educational programs; and that this person be responsible to the Director of Special Education.

2. It is recommended that all special education programming for visually handicapped children zero to twenty-one years of age be under the supervision of the Program Director for the Visually Handicapped and be in compliance with minimal state standards and guidelines.

3. It is recommended that the Psychologist for Visually and Hearing Impaired be responsible for coordinating diagnostic and evaluation services and placement recommendations for visually impaired and be assured adequate funds to contract for diagnostic services needed. This person will assume the responsibility for and eliminate the necessity of the present mandated Educational Clinical Team and Review Board.

4. It is recommended that an advisory council to the Program Director for Visually Handicapped, comprised of one representative from each agency that provides services from the public and/or private sectors be established. This group will be chaired by the Program Director for the Visually Handicapped.

5. It is recommended that statewide preschool educational programming for visually handicapped children be initiated by the Program Director for Visually Handicapped and that the Kansas State Board of Education earmark sufficient funds for such implementation.

6. It is recommended that the Kansas State School for the Visually Handicapped modify its program emphasis to specialize in providing services for the following visually handicapped children, to parents, and to teachers.

   a. Those children who are visually impaired and live in an area where there are no services available,

   b. Those children who are visually impaired and live in an area where there are services but live in a homesetting that fails to meet the needs of the child, and

   c. Those children who are visually impaired and have accompanying compounding handicapping conditions to the extent that they cannot adequately function in a public school program but are functioning at a level higher than is required to be accommodated in residential agencies for the retarded.

   d. Provide staff development for individuals working in the area of the visually impaired,

   e. Provide special parent-child training sessions,

   f. Provide post-secondary training for older members of the visually impaired population when not possible in the local areas; and

   g. Provide short term special training sessions when needed and not available locally.

7. It is recommended that the Kansas State Board of Education adopt the basic philosophy of placement and reveiw of placement indicated by the Cascade System of individualized educational programs. It is further recommended that adequate funding be allocated at all levels of educational service delivery throughout the state to implement this philosophy.

## THE LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

As with many such studies, the present study did not answer all the questions and, in fact, in some instances served to point out some additional unknowns.

The committee felt that the lessons learned from this study should be made explicit so that future research efforts might benefit. After the study was well along the way it became apparent that additional background and supplemental material having to do with the definitions of terms was needed. Even the definition of an educational program would have contributed. Sometime other than September would have allowed more time and would have been more convenient for those filling out the questionnaire. Finally, some assurances should be sought, in any future study, that the questionnaire is filled out by the most qualified person.

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

## STUDY OF PROGRAMS FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN AND YOUTH

– Kansas State Board of Education
– Kansas State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

**Data for Visually Impaired**
**Agency Report as of September 15, 1973**

1. [ ][ ][ ][ ] 1. Numerical code for individual.

2. [ ] 2. Sex
   1. Male
   2. Female
   9. Info. not available

3. [ ][ ] (Mo)
4. [ ][ ] (Day)
5. [ ][ ] (Yr)
   3. Date of Birth (02-12-58 means Feb. 12, 1958). 99 - for month indicates info. not available. [See Ques. 57.]

6. [ ][ ][ ] 4. Numerical code for residence (county) of parents or guardian. 999 - indicates info. not available

7. [ ][ ] (Mo)
8. [ ][ ] (Yr)
   5. Date of most recent eye evaluation. 99 - for month indicates info. not available [See Ques. 58.]

9. [ ] 6. Source of most recent eye evaluation
   1. Routine School Screening
   2. Optometrist
   3. Other M. D.
   4. Opthalmologist
   5. Other
   9. Info. not available

10. [ ] 7. Is individual legally blind?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   9. Info. not available

11. [ ][ ][ ]
12. [ ][ ][ ]
   8. Distance acuity after correction – better eye. When possible, give info. as a ratio (e.g. 020-200); otherwise, code as indicated below, coding single most descriptive item.

600-000 - Other
500-000 - Counts fingers
400-000 - Notes hand movements
300-000 - Has light perception
200-000 - No vision
100-000 - Individual cannot be tested
900-000 - Info. not available

9. Eye evaluation diagnosis (Check all that apply)
13. ___ a. Congenital cataracts
14. ___ b. Congenital glaucoma
15. ___ c. Retinoblastoma
16. ___ d. RLF
17. ___ e. Nystagmus
18. ___ f. Optic nerve atrophy
19. ___ g. Myopia
20. ___ h. Injury
21. ___ i. Other - please note _____
    _____
22. ___ 9. Info. not available

23. [ ] 10. Eye evaluation prognosis.
   1. Deteriorating
   2. Stable
   3. Capable of improvement
   4. Uncertain
   9. Info. not available

24. [ ][ ] (Mo)
25. [ ][ ] (Yr)
   11. Date of most recent hearing evaluation. 99 - for month indicates info. not available [See Ques. 60.]

26. [ ] 12. Source of most recent hearing evaluation.
   1. Routine school screening
   2. Audiologist
   3. Other M. D.
   4. Otologist
   5. Other
   9. Info.not available

27. [ ] 13. Results of hearing Evaluation
   1. Deaf-Prelingual
   2. Deaf-Postlingual
   3. Partial Hearing
   4. Hard of hearing
   5. No appreciable loss
   6. Unable to determine
   9. Info. not available

14. Does the individual have a physical condition (other than vision and hearing) which inhibits normal school activities (motion)?

28. ☐ No (check only)

29. ☐ Yes - Gross motor
1. Partially inhibited
2. Totall inhibited
9. Info. not available

30. ☐ Yes - Fine motor
1. Partially inhibited
2. Totally inhibited
9. Info. not available

Note prosthesis if applicable

_____
_____
_____

31. ☐ 15. Is this child subject to seizures?
1. No
2. Grand mal - uncontrolled
3. Grand mal - controlled
4. Petit mal - uncontrolled
5. Petit mal - controlled
9. Info. not available

32. ☐ 16. Does this individual have a medical condition which requires direct supervision (e.g., diabetes, glaucoma, grand mal)
1. Yes
Please note condition

_____
_____

2. No
9. Info. not available

17. Behavior - characteristically observed (see directions for more detail).

Characteristic

33. ☐ Normal
1. Usually
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely or Never
9. Info. not available

34. ☐ Disturbed - frequency of observed behavior
1. Usually
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely or Never
9. Info. not available

35. ☐ Disturbed - source of notation
1. Stereotyped
2. Diagnosed
3. Observable - not diagnosed
8. Not applicable
9. Info. not available

Situational

36. ☐ Physically aggressive to self
1. Rarely or never
2. Infrequently - not controlled
3. Infrequently - controlled
4. Frequently - not controlled
5. Frequently - controlled
9. Info. not available

37. ☐ Physically aggressive to others
1. Rarely or Never
2. Infrequently - not controlled
3. Infrequently - controlled
4. Frequently - not controlled
5. Frequently - controlled
9. Info. not available

38. ☐ Physically aggressive to objects
1. Rarely or Never
2. Infrequently - not controlled
3. Infrequently - controlled
4. Frequently - not controlled
5. Frequently - controlled
9. Info. not available

39. ☐ Verbally aggressive
1. Rarely or Never
2. Infrequently - not controlled
3. Infrequently - controlled
4. Frequently - not controlled
5. Frequently - controlled
9. Info. not available

40. ☐ Hyperactive
1. Rarely or Never
2. Infrequently - not controlled
3. Infrequently - controlled
4. Frequently - not controlled
5. Frequently - controlled
9. Info. not available

41. ☐ Passive
1. Rarely or Never
2. Infrequently - not controlled
3. Infrequently - controlled
4. Frequently - not controlled
5. Frequently - controlled
9. Info. not available

42. ☐ Withdrawn
1. Rarely or Never
2. Infrequently - not controlled
3. Infrequently - controlled
4. Frequently - not controlled
5. Frequently - controlled
9. Info. not available

43. ☐ 18. Primary communication medium
1. None
2. Gestural
3. Oral
4. Braille
5. Print
9. Info. not available

44. ☐ 19. Status of intelligence measure (there are two parts of this item)
1. No test given (individual cannot be tested)
2. No test given (individual could be tested)
3. Test attempted - no results
4. Individual has been tested
9. Info. not available

45. ☐ Results
1. Profound
2. Severe
3. Moderate
4. Mild
5. Borderline
6. Normal
7. Above Normal
8. Not applicable
9. Info. not available

46. ☐ 20. General level of academic achievement.
1. Pre-school
2. Primary
3. Intermediate
4. Junior High
5. Senior High
6. Post-Secondary
9. Info. not available

☐ 21. General level of basic skill development.

47. Dressing
1. Independent
2. Partially dependent
3. Totally dependent
9. Info. not available

48. Eating or Feeding
1. Independent
2. Partially dependent
3. Totally dependent
9. Info. not available

49. Toilet
1. Independent
2. Partially dependent
3. Totally dependent
9. Info. not available

50. ☐☐ 22. Average number of hours per week in a structured educational and/or training program (current month nearest whole hour)
98. No structured program
99. Info. not available

51. ☐ 23. Type of present educational program
1. None
2. Home Program
3. Readiness
4. Academic
5. Sheltered workshop
6. Vocational
7. Other - please note

_____

_____

9. Info. not available

52. ☐ 24. Parents' or guardian's attitude toward individual (enter most appropriate)
1. Overt rejection
2. Disguised rejection
3. Overprotective
4. Acceptance
8. Prefer not to answer
9. Info. not available

53. ☐ 25. Parents' or guardian's willingness to accept help from agency when needed (enter most appropriate)
1. Totally rejects help
2. Accepts help when coerced
3. Accepts help when prompted
4. Accepts help when offered
5. Seeks help
6. Actively seeks help (see directions)
8. Prefer not to answer
9. Info. not available

54. ☐ 26. Parent's or guardian's contact with agency
1. Rarely or Never
2. Infrequently
3. Frequently
4. Constantly (see directions)
8. Prefer not to answer
9. Info. not available

55. ☐ 27. Is this person currently in the most appropriate training setting?
1. Yes
2. No. Should be in a public school which has a special education program.
3. No. Should be in a residential setting for mentally retarded.
4. No. Should be in a residential setting for emotionally disturbed.
5. No. Should be in a residential setting for hearing impaired.
6. No. Should be in a residential setting for visually impaired.
7. No. Should have special training at home.
8. Uncertain
9. Info. not available

56. Agency.

57. Age in Years.

58. Years since last Eye Evaluation.

59. Acuity Ratio times 100.

60. Years since last Hearing Evaluation.

ATTACHMENTS

## NORMALIZATION PRINCIPLE AND CASCADE SYSTEM

Decisions must be made about (1) the school in which a child is to be enrolled; (2) the homeroom placement; and (3) where and when the pupil is to receive various aspects of his instructional program. In all three areas, placement should always be on a trial basis, after having reached the best possible tentative decisions based on a study of the pupil's own characteristics, his home and community situation, and the educational resources (or options) available. A major guiding principle should be the concept of "normalization." The child should be integrated into his own home, community and neighborhood school to the maximum degree possible.

The cascade system is designed to make available whatever different-from-the-mainstream kind of setting is required to control the learning variables deemed critical for the individual case. It is a system which facilitates tailoring of treatment to individual needs rather than a system for sorting out children so they will fit conditions designed according to group standards not necessarily suitable for the particular case.

The cascade system (and the pyramid system adapted from it) has the following characteristics. First it projects an array of placement options. Second, it shows these options extending from the most integrated to the most segregated. Third, it points up that the largest number of pupils should be served in the most integrated programs and the smallest number in the most segregated plans.

In terms of special education placement within this system, the goal should be to move pupils as far upward as possible. Therefore there should be constant evaluation to determine if a pupil can be advanced. While some pupils will require one type of program for a school year or more, others may need it only for months. Furthermore, it should be possible to make large skips in placement. For example, a child may move from Plan 10 (hospital treatment) completely back into the general education mainstream, or vice versa. Some pupils will require certain services for only part of a day. The goal is to keep the program as little special as possible for the adequate education of the child.

**Material taken from Exceptional Children in the Schools, Second Edition, by Lloyd M. Dunn, Editor**


Most integrated plans, 1 and 2
Type I exceptional pupils
Plan 1 Special education instructional materials and equipment only; enrolled in a regular day class.
Plan 2 Special education instructional materials and equipment plus special education consultative services to regular teacher only; enrolled in a regular day class.
Plan 3 Itinerant or school-based special education tutors; enrolled in a regular day class.
Type II exceptional pupils
Plan 4 Special education resource room and teacher; enrolled in a regular day class.
Plan 5 Part-time special day class where enrolled; receives some academic instruction in a regular day class.
Plan 6 Self-contained special day class where enrolled; receives no academic instruction in a regular day class.
Type III exceptional pupils
Plan 7 Combination regular and special day school; receives no academic instruction in a regular day class.
Plan 8 Special day school.
Plan 9 Special boarding school or residential facility.
Type IV exceptional pupils
Plan 10 Hospital instruction.
Plan 11 Homebound instruction.
Most segregated plans, 9, 10, and 11
Normalization placement principal: Move pupil down only as far as necessary; move back up as soon as possible.

*An inverted pyramid model to display 11 major administrative plans in special education from the most integrated to the most segregated, and from those that should serve the greatest numbers of pupils to those that should serve the least, classified for four types of exceptional children. Note: Plan 7 could shift up one category to serve Type II exceptional pupils when such children receive part of their academic instruction in a regular day class setting, as they often do.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The following pages contain a number of uninterpreted cross-tabulation analyses. These are but a very small proportion of what information is available from this study and were selected for presentation because they conform to the general thrust of the previously analyzed material.

*The "justified institutionalization" column refers to those visually impaired children who have one or more extreme rating or personal characteristic that would indicate a need for close care (health problems, medical problems, psychological problems, or social problems) or the need for a surrogate home based on present parental rejection. These are problems beyond their visual impairment and problems that have, in the past, been used to justify institutionalization. The decision to remove a young person from their home and community (even temporarily) is a difficult one and what might justify the decision in one instance might not in others (particularly if there are local health and social care resources that can assist).

* This refers to the second set of cross-tabulations. The first set are a simple analysis by residential setting or agency.

| Sex | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 60% (168) | 51% (48) | 65% (82) | 56% (25) | 55% (77) |
| Female | 40% (110) | 49% (46) | 35% (45) | 44% (20) | 45% (63) |
| Total No. of Responses | 278 | 94 | 127 | 45 | 140 |
| Number of No Responses | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |

| Number of Months from Most Recent Eye Evaluation | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1–6 months | 33% (61) | 11% (9) | 61% (74) | 26% (10) | 9% (10) |
| 7–12 months | 32% (60) | 81% (68) | 24% (29) | 18% (7) | 16% (18) |
| 13–18 months | 10% (18) | 5% (4) | 5% (6) | 5% (2) | 10% (11) |
| 19–24 months | 13% (24) | 2% (2) | 6% (7) | 0% (0) | 10% (12) |
| 25–30 months | 2% (4) | 0% (0) | 1% (1) | 5% (2) | 16% (18) |
| 31–36 months | 5% (10) | 0% (0) | 3% (4) | 5% (2) | 7% (8) |
| 37+ months | 5% (10) | 1% (1) | 1% (1) | 39% (15) | 33% (38) |
| Total No. of Responses | 187 | 84 | 122 | 38 | 115 |
| Number of No Responses | 102 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 28 |

| Source of Most Recent Eye Evaluation | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Routine School Screening | 20% (51) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 2% (1) | 0% (0) |
| Optometrist | 12% (30) | 1% (1) | 40% (49) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) |
| Other M.D. | 5% (12) | 8% (7) | 51% (63) | 25% (11) | 2% (3) |
| Opthamologist | 62% (158) | 91% (78) | 10% (12) | 66% (29) | 96% (133) |
| Other | 1% (2) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 7% (3) | 1% (2) |
| Total No. of Responses | 253 | 86 | 124 | 44 | 138 |
| Number of No Responses | 36 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| Is Individual Legally Blind? | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 39% | (99) | 90% | (76) | 59% | (72) | 65% | (22) | 96% | (131) |
| No | 61% | (155) | 10% | (8) | 41% | (50) | 35% | (12) | 4% | (6) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 254 | | 84 | | 122 | | 34 | | 137 |
| Number of No Responses | | 35 | | 10 | | 5 | | 14 | | 6 |

| Distance Acuity After Correction, Better Eye | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cannot Be Tested | 6% | (13) | 2% | (2) | 14% | (12) | 7% | (2) | 10% | (13) |
| No Vision | 8% | (17) | 39% | (33) | 38% | (33) | 25% | (7) | 19% | (24) |
| Has Light Perception | 4% | (9) | 9% | (8) | 17% | (15) | 39% | (11) | 13% | (17) |
| Notes Hand Movements | 2% | (5) | 5% | (4) | 8% | (7) | 18% | (5) | 2% | (3) |
| Counts Fingers | 0% | (1) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 6% | (7) |
| Other | 7% | (16) | 0% | (0) | 10% | (9) | 11% | (3) | 2% | (2) |
| 20/20 or below | 4% | (8) | 0% | (0) | 3% | (3) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| 20/21 – 20/50 | 13% | (27) | 1% | (1) | 2% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (2) |
| 20/51 – 20/70 | 15% | (33) | 7% | (6) | 2% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| 20/71 – 20/200 | 35% | (75) | 18% | (15) | 5% | (4) | 0% | (0) | 28% | (36) |
| 20/201 and above | 6% | (12) | 18% | (15) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 18% | (23) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 216 | | 85 | | 88 | | 28 | | 127 |
| Number of No Responses | | 73 | | 9 | | 39 | | 20 | | 16 |

| Eye Evaluation Diagnosis | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Congenital Cataracts | 17% | (36) | 7% | (6) | 22% | (22) | 10% | (4) | 20% | (28) |
| Congenital Glaucoma | 4% | (9) | 3% | (3) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (1) | 7% | (10) |
| Retinoblastoma | 3% | (6) | 6% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (1) | 7% | (10) |
| RLF | 6% | (13) | 25% | (22) | 8% | (8) | 0% | (0) | 22% | (30) |
| Nystagmus | 30% | (63) | 14% | (12) | 40% | (40) | 27% | (11) | 37% | (52) |
| Optic Nerve Atrophy | 7% | (14) | 22% | (19) | 15% | (15) | 35% | (14) | 12% | (16) |
| Myopia | 23% | (49) | 7% | (6) | 13% | (13) | 7% | (3) | 4% | (5) |
| Injury | 3% | (6) | 3% | (3) | 1% | (1) | 5% | (2) | 1% | (1) |
| Other | 42% | (89) | 46% | (40) | 40% | (40) | 50% | (20) | 47% | (65) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 212 | | 87 | | 100 | | 40 | | 139 |
| Number of No Responses | | 77 | | 7 | | 27 | | 8 | | 4 |

| Eye Evaluation Prognosis | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Deteriorating | 12% | (24) | 16% | (14) | 8% | (9) | 18% | (6) | 9% | (10) |
| Stable | 55% | (110) | 77% | (66) | 50% | (55) | 21% | (7) | 71% | (82) |
| Capable of Improvement | 4% | (9) | 0% | (0) | 14% | (15) | 6% | (2) | 4% | (5) |
| Uncertain | 28% | (57) | 7% | (6) | 28% | (31) | 55% | (18) | 16% | (19) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 200 | | 86 | | 110 | | 33 | | 116 |
| Number of No Responses | | 89 | | 8 | | 17 | | 15 | | 27 |

| Number of Months from Most Recent Hearing Evaluation | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1–6 months | 22% | (27) | 74% | (61) | 80% | (65) | 10% | (4) | 24% | (12) |
| 7–12 months | 40% | (49) | 22% | (18) | 15% | (12) | 3% | (1) | 10% | (5) |
| 13–18 months | 4% | (5) | 1% | (1) | 5% | (4) | 51% | (20) | 16% | (8) |
| 19–24 months | 27% | (33) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 18% | (9) |
| 25–30 months | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 14% | (7) |
| 31–36 months | 7% | (8) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 3% | (1) | 6% | (3) |
| 37+ months | 0% | (0) | 2% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 33% | (13) | 10% | (5) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 123 | | 82 | | 81 | | 39 | | 49 |
| Number of No Responses | | 166 | | 12 | | 46 | | 9 | | 94 |

| Source of Most Recent Hearing Evaluation | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Routine School Screening | 75% | (119) | 66% | (54) | 0% | (0) | 3% | (1) | 4% | (2) |
| Audiologist | 16% | (25) | 34% | (28) | 13% | (11) | 49% | (19) | 20% | (10) |
| Other M.D. | 3% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 71% | (61) | 10% | (4) | 4% | (2) |
| Otologist | 5% | (8) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 5% | (2) | 8% | (4) |
| Other | 1% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 16% | (14) | 33% | (13) | 65% | (33) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 159 | | 82 | | 86 | | 39 | | 51 |
| Number of No Responses | | 130 | | 12 | | 41 | | 9 | | 92 |

| Results of Hearing Evaluation | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Deaf–Prelingual | 2% | (4) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 5% | (2) | 0% | (0) |
| Deaf–Postlingual | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (1) | 0% | (0) |
| Partial Hearing | 2% | (3) | 10% | (8) | 8% | (7) | 7% | (3) | 2% | (1) |
| Hard of Hearing | 8% | (13) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 7% | (3) | 14% | (7) |
| No Appreciable Loss | 84% | (135) | 85% | (70) | 60% | (52) | 59% | (24) | 82% | (42) |
| Unable to Determine | 4% | (6) | 4% | (3) | 32% | (28) | 20% | (8) | 2% | (1) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 161 | | 82 | | 87 | | 41 | | 51 |
| Number of No Responses | | 128 | | 12 | | 40 | | 7 | | 92 |

| Physical Condition other than Vision and Hearing which Inhibits Normal School Activity (Motor) | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No | 76% | (215) | 88% | (83) | 34% | (43) | 2% | (1) | 59% | (75) |
| Gross Motor–Partially Inhibited | 2% | (7) | 5% | (5) | 4% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) |
| Gross Motor–Totally Inhibited | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Has Gross Motor but information not available | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Fine Motor–Partially Inhibited | 3% | (9) | 1% | (1) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Fine Motor–Totally Inhibited | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) |
| Has Fine Motor but information not available | 0% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Gross Motor–Partially Inhibited & Fine Motor–Partially Inhibited | 12% | (34) | 4% | (4) | 30% | (38) | 19% | (9) | 7% | (9) |
| Gross Motor–Partially Inhibited & Fine Motor–Totally Inhibited | 0% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 6% | (3) | 1% | (1) |
| Gross Motor–Totally Inhibited & Fine Motor–Partially Inhibited | 1% | (2) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Gross Motor–Totally Inhibited & Fine Motor–Totally Inhibited | 2% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 30% | (38) | 73% | (35) | 0% | (0) |
| Gross Motor–Partially Inhibited & Fine Motor but information not available | 0% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 3% | (4) |
| Gross Motor–Totally Inhibited & Fine Motor but information not available | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) |
| Gross Motor but information not available & Fine Motor–Partially Inhibited | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Gross Motor but information not available & Fine Motor–Totally Inhibited | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Gross Motor but information not availalbe & Fine Motor but information not available | 3% | (8) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 28% | (36) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 283 | | 94 | | 125 | | 48 | | 128 |
| Number of No Responses | | 6 | | 0 | | 2 | | 0 | | 15 |

| Is Child Subject to Seizures? | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No | 98% (237) | 89% (84) | 50% (63) | 35% (17) | 96% (71) |
| Grand Mal–Uncontrolled | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 6% (7) | 4% (2) | 0% (0) |
| Grand Mal–Controlled | 1% (2) | 7% (7) | 38% (47) | 44% (21) | 0% (0) |
| Petit Mal–Uncontrolled | 0% (1) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 4% (2) | 4% (3) |
| Petit Mal–Controlled | 1% (3) | 3% (3) | 6% (8) | 13% (6) | 0% (0) |
| Total No. of Responses | 243 | 94 | 125 | 48 | 74 |
| Number of No Responses | 46 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 69 |

| Does this Individual Have a Medical Condition Requiring Direct Supervision? | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 9% (24) | 23% (22) | 45% (49) | 83% (40) | 19% (16) |
| No | 91% (232) | 77% (72) | 55% (59) | 17% (8) | 81% (70) |
| Total No. of Responses | 256 | 94 | 108 | 48 | 86 |
| Number of No Responses | 33 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 57 |

| Characteristic–Normal | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Usually | 80% (202) | 83% (78) | 53% (58) | 17% (8) | 88% (83) |
| Sometimes | 15% (38) | 16% (15) | 33% (36) | 13% (6) | 9% (8) |
| Rarely or Never | 5% (13) | 1% (1) | 14% (15) | 71% (34) | 3% (3) |
| Total No. of Responses | 253 | 94 | 109 | 48 | 94 |
| Number of No Responses | 36 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 49 |

| Characteristic–Disturbed | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Usually | 7% (17) | 9% (8) | 10% (11) | 63% (30) | 3% (3) |
| Sometimes | 22% (53) | 24% (23) | 48% (54) | 19% (9) | 24% (21) |
| Rarely or Never | 71% (169) | 67% (63) | 42% (47) | 19% (9) | 72% (62) |
| Total No. of Responses | 239 | 94 | 112 | 48 | 86 |
| Number of No Responses | 50 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 57 |

| Characteristic–Disturbed (Source of Notation) | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stereotyped | 21% | (14) | 6% | (2) | 14% | (10) | 11% | (1) | 0% | (0) |
| Diagnosed | 20% | (13) | 16% | (5) | 54% | (38) | 11% | (1) | 30% | (7) |
| Observable–Not Diagnosed | 59% | (39) | 78% | (25) | 31% | (22) | 78% | (7) | 70% | (16) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 66 | | 32 | | 70 | | 9 | | 23 |
| Number of No Responses | | 173 | | 62 | | 42 | | 39 | | 63 |

| Situational–Physically Aggressive to Self | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 91% | (222) | 96% | (90) | 71% | (87) | 77% | (37) | 94% | (59) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 2% | (5) | 1% | (1) | 7% | (8) | 2% | (1) | 3% | (2) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 3% | (8) | 3% | (3) | 11% | (14) | 10% | (5) | 2% | (1) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 2% | (6) | 0% | (0) | 7% | (8) | 8% | (4) | 2% | (1) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 1% | (3) | 0% | (0) | 5% | (6) | 2% | (1) | 0% | (0) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 244 | | 94 | | 123 | | 48 | | 63 |
| Number of No Responses | | 45 | | 0 | | 4 | | 0 | | 80 |

| Situational–Physically Aggressive to Others | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 84% | (207) | 88% | (83) | 67% | (83) | 94% | (45) | 92% | (59) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 2% | (6) | 2% | (2) | 3% | (4) | 0% | (0) | 3% | (2) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 8% | (20) | 7% | (7) | 16% | (20) | 4% | (2) | 3% | (2) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 2% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 10% | (12) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (1) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 3% | (8) | 2% | (2) | 4% | (5) | 2% | (1) | 0% | (0) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 246 | | 94 | | 124 | | 48 | | 64 |
| Number of No Responses | | 43 | | 0 | | 3 | | 0 | | 79 |

| Situational–Physically Aggressive to Objects | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 91% | (220) | 95% | (89) | 78% | (97) | 94% | (45) | 98% | (58) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 2% | (6) | 3% | (3) | 2% | (3) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 4% | (10) | 2% | (2) | 9% | (11) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (1) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 1% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 9% | (11) | 2% | (1) | 0% | (0) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 2% | (4) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (2) | 4% | (2) | 0% | (0) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 242 | | 94 | | 124 | | 48 | | 59 |
| Number of No Responses | | 47 | | 0 | | 3 | | 0 | | 84 |

| Situational–Verbally Aggressive | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 81% | (198) | 79% | (74) | 81% | (102) | 94% | (44) | 87% | (53) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 2% | (6) | 3% | (3) | 3% | (4) | 0% | (0) | 3% | (2) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 8% | (19) | 7% | (7) | 4% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (1) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 3% | (8) | 6% | (6) | 9% | (11) | 2% | (1) | 7% | (4) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 6% | (14) | 4% | (4) | 3% | (4) | 4% | (2) | 2% | (1) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 245 | | 94 | | 126 | | 47 | | 61 |
| Number of No Responses | | 44 | | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | 82 |

| Hyperactive | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 80% | (191) | 85% | (80) | 68% | (79) | 72% | (34) | 89% | (54) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 2% | (4) | 3% | (3) | 4% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 5% | (3) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 9% | (21) | 9% | (8) | 14% | (16) | 13% | (6) | 0% | (0) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 3% | (6) | 1% | (1) | 8% | (9) | 13% | (6) | 5% | (3) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 7% | (16) | 2% | (2) | 7% | (8) | 2% | (1) | 2% | (1) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 238 | | 94 | | 117 | | 47 | | 61 |
| Number of No Responses | | 51 | | 0 | | 10 | | 1 | | 82 |

| Passive | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 71% | (168) | 81% | (76) | 39% | (44) | 36% | (17) | 79% | (45) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 3% | (8) | 2% | (2) | 3% | (3) | 2% | (1) | 4% | (2) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 9% | (21) | 5% | (5) | 17% | (19) | 15% | (7) | 7% | (4) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 8% | (18) | 11% | (10) | 20% | (22) | 34% | (16) | 11% | (6) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 10% | (23) | 1% | (1) | 21% | (24) | 13% | (6) | 0% | (0) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 238 | | 94 | | 112 | | 47 | | 57 |
| Number of No Responses | | 51 | | 0 | | 15 | | 1 | | 86 |

| Withdrawn | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 74% | (175) | 71% | (67) | 64% | (65) | 74% | (34) | 77% | (46) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 3% | (8) | 3% | (3) | 2% | (2) | 4% | (2) | 8% | (5) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 12% | (29) | 6% | (6) | 14% | (14) | 4% | (2) | 2% | (1) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 6% | (14) | 16% | (15) | 11% | (11) | 15% | (7) | 12% | (7) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 4% | (10) | 3% | (3) | 10% | (10) | 2% | (1) | 2% | (1) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 236 | | 94 | | 102 | | 46 | | 60 |
| Number of No Responses | | 53 | | 0 | | 25 | | 2 | | 83 |

| Primary Communication Medium | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 5% | (13) | 4% | (4) | 50% | (63) | 78% | (36) | 8% | (6) |
| Gestural | 2% | (6) | 0% | (0) | 12% | (15) | 13% | (6) | 9% | (7) |
| Oral | 51% | (129) | 13% | (12) | 37% | (46) | 9% | (4) | 21% | (16) |
| Braille | 5% | (13) | 44% | (41) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 41% | (31) |
| Print | 37% | (93) | 39% | (37) | 2% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 21% | (16) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 254 | | 94 | | 126 | | 46 | | 76 |
| Number of No Responses | | 35 | | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 67 |

| Status of Intelligence Measure | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Test Given (Can't be tested) | 2% | (5) | 7% | (6) | 6% | (8) | 2% | (1) | 10% | (8) |
| No Test Given (Could be tested) | 13% | (31) | 4% | (4) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 5% | (4) |
| Test Attempted–No Results | 1% | (3) | 83% | (74) | 6% | (8) | 4% | (2) | 1% | (1) |
| Individual Has Been Tested | 83% | (192) | 6% | (5) | 86% | (108) | 94% | (44) | 84% | (69) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 231 | | 89 | | 125 | | 47 | | 82 |
| Number of No Responses | | 58 | | 5 | | 2 | | 1 | | 61 |

| Results of Intelligence Measure | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Profound | 3% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 66% | (77) | 85% | (39) | 0% | (0) |
| Severe | 5% | (10) | 1% | (1) | 15% | (17) | 13% | (6) | 3% | (2) |
| Moderate | 9% | (18) | 5% | (4) | 9% | (11) | 2% | (1) | 4% | (3) |
| Mild | 7% | (13) | 20% | (16) | 9% | (10) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) |
| Borderline | 14% | (27) | 20% | (16) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 6% | (4) |
| Normal | 45% | (87) | 44% | (35) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 34% | (24) |
| Above Normal | 13% | (26) | 8% | (6) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 27% | (19) |
| Not Applicable | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 3% | (2) |
| Information Not Available | 4% | (7) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 21% | (15) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 193 | | 79 | | 116 | | 46 | | 70 |
| Number of No Responses | | 2 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |

| General Level of Academic Achievement | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-School | 17% | (45) | 12% | (11) | 70% | (57) | 97% | (31) | 25% | (25) |
| Primary | 31% | (84) | 16% | (15) | 24% | (20) | 3% | (1) | 2% | (2) |
| Intermediate | 21% | (57) | 35% | (32) | 2% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 4% | (4) |
| Junior High | 13% | (34) | 20% | (18) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) |
| Senior High | 18% | (47) | 17% | (16) | 2% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 32% | (32) |
| Post-Secondary | 0% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 35% | (35) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 268 | | 92 | | 82 | | 32 | | 99 |
| Number of No Responses | | 21 | | 2 | | 45 | | 16 | | 44 |

| Dressing | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent | 85% (217) | 93% (87) | 16% (20) | 2% (1) | 91% (61) |
| Partially Dependent | 7% (17) | 3% (3) | 44% (55) | 9% (4) | 7% (5) |
| Totally Dependent | 9% (22) | 4% (4) | 40% (51) | 89% (42) | 1% (1) |
| Total No. of Responses | 256 | 94 | 126 | 47 | 67 |
| Number of No Responses | 33 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 76 |

| Eating or Feeding | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent | 87% (230) | 94% (88) | 34% (43) | 11% (5) | 91% (64) |
| Partially Dependent | 7% (18) | 2% (2) | 29% (36) | 6% (3) | 7% (5) |
| Totally Dependent | 6% (15) | 4% (4) | 37% (47) | 83% (39) | 1% (1) |
| Total No. of Responses | 263 | 94 | 126 | 47 | 70 |
| Number of No Responses | 26 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 73 |

| Toilet | U.S.D. | KSVH | KNI | Winfield | SFB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent | 89% (235) | 93% (87) | 32% (38) | 6% (3) | 91% (63) |
| Partially Dependent | 3% (9) | 3% (3) | 34% (41) | 6% (3) | 6% (4) |
| Totally Dependent | 7% (19) | 4% (4) | 34% (40) | 87% (41) | 3% (2) |
| Total No. of Responses | 263 | 94 | 119 | 47 | 69 |
| Number of No Responses | 26 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 74 |

| Average Number of Hours per Week in Structured Education and/or Training Program | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Structured Program | 12% | (30) | 0% | (0) | 44% | (55) | 74% | (35) | 58% | (18) |
| 1–5 hours | 11% | (28) | 0% | (0) | 10% | (12) | 2% | (1) | 3% | (1) |
| 6–10 hours | 3% | (8) | 3% | (3) | 9% | (11) | 9% | (4) | 0% | (0) |
| 11–15 hours | 3% | (8) | 0% | (0) | 8% | (10) | 6% | (3) | 0% | (0) |
| 16–20 hours | 0% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 9% | (11) | 4% | (2) | 0% | (0) |
| 21–25 hours | 4% | (10) | 0% | (0) | 4% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| 26–30 hours | 46% | (115) | 94% | (88) | 7% | (9) | 2% | (1) | 0% | (0) |
| 31–35 hours | 18% | (45) | 0% | (0) | 6% | (8) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| 36–40 hours | 1% | (3) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (3) | 2% | (1) | 39% | (12) |
| 41 or more hours | 0% | (0) | 3% | (3) | 2% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 248 | | 94 | | 126 | | 47 | | 31 |
| Number of No Responses | | 41 | | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | 112 |

| Type of Present Education Program | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 3% | (8) | 1% | (1) | 47% | (59) | 74% | (34) | 22% | (20) |
| Home Program | 2% | (6) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 10% | (9) |
| Readiness | 5% | (13) | 16% | (15) | 20% | (25) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (2) |
| Academic | 77% | (210) | 68% | (64) | 14% | (18) | 0% | (0) | 35% | (33) |
| Sheltered Workshop | 3% | (7) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 12% | (11) |
| Vocational | 0% | (0) | 15% | (14) | 10% | (12) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (2) |
| Other | 10% | (27) | 0% | (0) | 8% | (10) | 26% | (12) | 17% | (16) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 271 | | 94 | | 125 | | 46 | | 93 |
| Number of No Responses | | 18 | | 0 | | 2 | | 2 | | 50 |

| Parents' or Guardian's Attitude Toward Individual | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overt Rejection | 1% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 10% | (11) | 8% | (4) | 3% | (3) |
| Disguised Rejection | 7% | (15) | 10% | (9) | 15% | (16) | 0% | (0) | 8% | (8) |
| Overprotective | 12% | (28) | 7% | (7) | 7% | (7) | 0% | (0) | 24% | (25) |
| Acceptance | 76% | (173) | 83% | (78) | 67% | (72) | 75% | (36) | 66% | (69) |
| Prefer Not to Answer | 4% | (9) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) | 17% | (8) | 0% | (0) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 227 | | 94 | | 107 | | 48 | | 105 |
| Number of No Responses | | 62 | | 0 | | 20 | | 0 | | 38 |

| Parents' or Guardian's Willingness to Accept Help from Agency When Needed | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Totally Rejects Help | 4% | (8) | 1% | (1) | 13% | (13) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) |
| Accepts Help when Coerced | 6% | (13) | 15% | (14) | 12% | (12) | 4% | (2) | 8% | (8) |
| Accepts Help when Prompted | 10% | (23) | 48% | (45) | 10% | (10) | 6% | (3) | 10% | (10) |
| Accepts Help when Offered | 50% | (113) | 12% | (11) | 44% | (44) | 21% | (10) | 23% | (24) |
| Seeks Help | 22% | (50) | 22% | (21) | 20% | (20) | 56% | (27) | 56% | (59) |
| Actively Seeks Help | 2% | (5) | 2% | (2) | 2% | (2) | 0% | (0) | 3% | (3) |
| Prefer Not to Answer | 5% | (12) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 13% | (6) | 0% | (0) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 224 | | 94 | | 101 | | 48 | | 105 |
| Number of No Responses | | 65 | | 0 | | 26 | | 0 | | 38 |

| Parents' or Guardian's Contact with Agency | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 13% | (28) | 11% | (10) | 31% | (36) | 23% | (11) | 12% | (12) |
| Infrequently | 43% | (94) | 43% | (40) | 32% | (38) | 17% | (8) | 49% | (48) |
| Frequently | 40% | (87) | 47% | (44) | 37% | (43) | 48% | (23) | 39% | (38) |
| Constantly | 0% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| Prefer Not to Answer | 4% | (8) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 13% | (6) | 0% | (0) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 218 | | 94 | | 117 | | 48 | | 98 |
| Number of No Responses | | 71 | | 0 | | 10 | | 0 | | 45 |

| Is this person currently in the most appropriate training setting? | U.S.D. | | KSVH | | KNI | | Winfield | | SFB | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 83% | (219) | 99% | (93) | 91% | (108) | 96% | (46) | 75% | (75) |
| No–Should be in public school special education | 2% | (5) | 0% | (0) | 3% | (3) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) |
| No–Should be in residential setting for mentally retarded | 0% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) |
| No–Should be in residential setting for emotionally disturbed | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| No–Should be in residential setting for hearing impaired | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| No–Should be in residential setting for visually impaired | 3% | (8) | 1% | (1) | 3% | (3) | 0% | (0) | 0% | (0) |
| No–Should have special training at home | 0% | (1) | 0% | (0) | 1% | (1) | 2% | (1) | 0% | (0) |
| Uncertain | 12% | (31) | 0% | (0) | 2% | (2) | 2% | (1) | 23% | (23) |
| Total No. of Responses | | 265 | | 94 | | 119 | | 48 | | 100 |
| Number of No Responses | | 24 | | 0 | | 8 | | 0 | | 43 |

| Institution | * Total of Visually Impaired Population | * Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| U.S.D. | 41% (289) | 33% (120) |
| KSVH | 13% (94) | 10% (37) |
| KNI | 18% (127) | 33% (121) |
| Parsons | 1% (4) | 1% (3) |
| Winfield | 7% (48) | 13% (48) |
| SFB | 20% (143) | 10% (37) |
| I.L. | 0% (3) | 0% (1) |
| Total No. of Resoonses | 100% 708 | 100% 367 |
| Number of No Responses | 0 | 0 |

* These columns take the total number of visually impaired young people in Kansas (708) and also the portion of the total group that has one or more characteristics that might justify institutionalization (367 of the 708), and it indicates the proportion of both of these groups that are associated with each of the variables (institutions) located in the far left column.

| Sex | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 59% (405) | 60% (217) |
| Female | 41% (286) | 40% (144) |
| Total No. of Responses | 691 | 361 |
| Number of No Responses | 17 | 6 |

| Number of Months from Most Recent Eye Evaluation | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| 1 – 6 months | 30% (166) | 41% (121) |
| 7 – 12 months | 33% (182) | 31% (90) |
| 13 – 18 months | 8% (43) | 7% (20) |
| 19 – 24 months | 9% (47) | 6% (17) |
| 25 – 30 months | 5% (25) | 3% (9) |
| 31 – 36 months | 4% (24) | 4% (12) |
| 37+ months | 12% (65) | 9% (26) |
| Total No. of Responses | 552 | 295 |
| Number of No Responses | 156 | 72 |

| Source of Most Recent Eye Evaluation | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Routine School Screening | 8% (53) | 4% (15) |
| Optometrist | 12% (80) | 18% (63) |
| Other M. D. | 15% (96) | 24% (82) |
| Opthamologist | 64% (415) | 52% (180) |
| Other | 1% (8) | 1% (4) |
| Total No. of Responses | 652 | 344 |
| Number of No Responses | 56 | 23 |

| Is Individual Legally Blind | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 63% (401) | 62% (200) |
| No | 37% (237) | 38% (123) |
| Total No. of Responses | 638 | 323 |
| Number of No Responses | 70 | 44 |

| Distance Acuity After Correction, Better Eye | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Cannot Be Tested | 8% (42) | 13% (35) |
| No Vision | 21% (114) | 25% (69) |
| Has Light Perception | 11% (60) | 15% (40) |
| Notes Hand Movement | 5% (25) | 8% (21) |
| Counts Fingers | 2% (9) | 0% (1) |
| Other | 6% (33) | 7% (18) |
| 20/20 or below | 2% (11) | 1% (2) |
| 20/21 – 20/50 | 6% (32) | 4% (11) |
| 20/51 – 20/70 | 7% (41) | 6% (16) |
| 20/71 – 20/200 | 24% (131) | 16% (43) |
| 20/201 or above | 9% (52) | 6% (16) |
| Total No. of Responses | 550 | 272 |
| Number of No Responses | 158 | 95 |

| Eye Evaluation Diagnosis | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Congenital Cataracts | 17% (100) | 17% (51) |
| Congenital Glaucoma | 4% (23) | 3% (8) |
| Retinoblastoma | 4% (22) | 2% (7) |
| RLF | 12% (73) | 10% (31) |
| Nystagmus | 31% (181) | 31% (93) |
| Optic Nerve Atrophy | 13% (78) | 15% (46) |
| Myopia | 13% (78) | 15% (44) |
| Injury | 2% (13) | 2% (7) |
| Other | 44% (257) | 44% (133) |
| Total No. of Responses | 585 | 301 |
| Number of No Responses | 123 | 66 |

| Eye Evaluation Prognosis | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Deteriorating | 11% (63) | 13% (38) |
| Stable | 59% (327) | 51% (151) |
| Capable of Improvement | 6% (31) | 7% (20) |
| Uncertain | 24% (131) | 29% (85) |
| Total No. of Responses | 552 | 294 |
| Number of No Responses | 156 | 73 |

| Number of Months from Most Recent Hearing Evaluation | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| 1–6 months | 45% (173) | 50% (113) |
| 7–12 months | 22% (85) | 22% (49) |
| 13–18 months | 10% (39) | 12% (27) |
| 19–24 months | 11% (42) | 6% (13) |
| 25–30 months | 2% (8) | 1% (2) |
| 31–36 months | 3% (12) | 2% (5) |
| 37+ months | 6% (22) | 7% (16) |
| Total No. of Responses | 381 | 225 |
| Number of No Responses | 327 | 142 |

| Source of Most Recent Hearing Evaluation | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Routine School Screening | 42% (176) | 30% (77) |
| Audiologist | 23% (99) | 27% (69) |
| Other M.D. | 17% (72) | 26% (66) |
| Otologist | 3% (14) | 3% (7) |
| Other | 15% (63) | 14% (35) |
| Total No. of Responses | 424 | 254 |
| Number of No Responses | 284 | 113 |

| Results of Hearing Evaluation | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Deaf–Prelingual | 1% (6) | 2% (5) |
| Deaf–Postlingual | 0% (1) | 0% (1) |
| Partial Hearing | 5% (23) | 7% (17) |
| Hard of Hearing | 6% (26) | 4% (11) |
| No Appreciable Loss | 76% (325) | 70% (179) |
| Unable to Determine | 11% (46) | 16% (42) |
| Total No. of Responses | 427 | 255 |
| Number of No Responses | 281 | 112 |

| Is Child Subject to Seizures? | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| No | 81% (477) | 68% (219) |
| Grand Mal–Uncontrolled | 2% (10) | 3% (10) |
| Grand Mal–Controlled | 13% (77) | 22% (70) |
| Petit Mal–Uncontrolled | 1% (6) | 2% (5) |
| Petit Mal–Controlled | 4% (21) | 6% (19) |
| Total No. of Responses | 591 | 323 |
| Number of No Responses | 117 | 44 |

| Physical Condition other than Vision and Hearing which Inhibits Normal School Activity (Motor) | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| No | 61% (418) | 47% (169) |
| Gross Motor–Partially Inhibited | 3% (18) | 4% (13) |
| Gross Motor–Totally Inhibited | 0% (0) | 0% (0) |
| Has Gross Motor but information not available | 0% (0) | 0% (0) |
| Fine Motor–Partially Inhibited | 2% (11) | 1% (3) |
| Fine Motor–Totally Inhibited | 0% (2) | 1% (2) |
| Has Fine Motor but information not available | 0% (1) | 0% (0) |
| Gross Motor–Partially Inhibited & Fine Motor–Partially Inhibited | 14% (97) | 20% (74) |
| Gross Motor–Partially Inhibited & Fine Motor–Totally Inhibited | 1% (5) | 1% (4) |
| Gross Motor–Totally Inhibited & Fine Motor–Partially Inhibited | 0% (3) | 1% (2) |
| Gross Motor–Totally Inhibited & Fine Motor–Totally Inhibited | 12% (79) | 22% (79) |
| Gross Motor–Partially Inhibited & Fine Motor but information not available | 1% (5) | 1% (3) |
| Gross Motor–Totally Inhibited & Fine Motor but information not available | 0% (1) | 0% (1) |
| Gross Motor but information not available & Fine Motor–Partially Inhibited | 0% (0) | 0% (0) |
| Gross Motor but information not available & Fine Motor–Totally Inhibited | 0% (0) | 0% (0) |
| Gross Motor but information not available & Fine Motor but information not available | 6% (44) | 4% (13) |
| Total No. of Responses | 684 | 363 |
| Number of No Responses | 24 | 4 |

| Does this Individual Have a Medical Condition Requiring Direct Supervision? | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 25% (152) | 38% (120) |
| No | 75% (447) | 62% (196) |
| Total No. of Responses | 599 | 316 |
| Number of No Responses | 109 | 51 |

| Characteristic–Normal | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Usually | 72% (433) | 49% (163) |
| Sometimes | 17% (103) | 31% (101) |
| Rarely or Never | 11% (66) | 20% (66) |
| Total No. of Responses | 602 | 330 |
| Number of No Responses | 106 | 37 |

| Characteristic–Disturbed | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Usually | 12% (69) | 21% (69) |
| Sometimes | 28% (163) | 47% (154) |
| Rarely or Never | 60% (354) | 33% (108) |
| Total No. of Responses | 586 | 331 |
| Number of No Responses | 122 | 36 |

| Characteristic–Disturbed (Source of Notation) | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Stereotyped | 13% (27) | 13% (27) |
| Diagnosed | 32% (65) | 32% (65) |
| Observable–Not Diagnosed | 54% (109) | 54% (109) |
| Total No. of Responses | 201 | 201 |
| Number of No Responses | 385 | 130 |

| Situational–Physically Aggressive to Self | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 86% (498) | 76% (255) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 3% (19) | 5% (18) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 6% (33) | 10% (32) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 3% (19) | 6% (19) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 2% (10) | 3% (10) |
| Total No. of Responses | 579 | 334 |
| Number of No Responses | 129 | 33 |

| Situational–Physically Aggressive to Others | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 83% (481) | 72% (242) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 2% (14) | 4% (13) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 9% (53) | 14% (46) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 3% (18) | 5% (18) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 3% (17) | 5% (17) |
| Total No. of Responses | 583 | 336 |
| Number of No Responses | 125 | 31 |

| Situational–Physically Aggressive to Objects | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 90% (515) | 83% (273) |
| Infrequently–Not Controlled | 2% (12) | 4% (12) |
| Infrequently–Controlled | 4% (25) | 7% (22) |
| Frequently–Not Controlled | 2% (14) | 4% (14) |
| Frequently–Controlled | 1% (8) | 2% (8) |
| Total No. of Responses | 574 | 329 |
| Number of No Responses | 134 | 38 |

| Situational—Verbally Aggressive | Total of Visual Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 82% (477) | 72% (243) |
| Infrequently—Not Controlled | 3% (16) | 4% (13) |
| Infrequently—Controlled | 6% (32) | 8% (26) |
| Frequently—Not Controlled | 5% (30) | 9% (30) |
| Frequently—Controlled | 4% (25) | 7% (25) |
| Total No. of Responses | 580 | 337 |
| Number of No Responses | 128 | 30 |

| Hyperactive | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalized |
|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 79% (443) | 67% (214) |
| Infrequently—Not Controlled | 3% (15) | 4% (12) |
| Infrequently—Controlled | 9% (51) | 12% (40) |
| Frequently—Not Controlled | 4% (25) | 8% (25) |
| Frequently—Controlled | 5% (30) | 9% (30) |
| Total No. of Responses | 564 | 321 |
| Number of No Responses | 144 | 46 |

| Passive | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 64% (356) | 43% (135) |
| Infrequently—Not Controlled | 3% (16) | 4% (13) |
| Infrequently—Controlled | 10% (56) | 12% (38) |
| Frequently—Not Controlled | 13% (72) | 23% (72) |
| Frequently—Controlled | 10% (55) | 18% (55) |
| Total No. of Responses | 555 | 313 |
| Number of No Responses | 153 | 54 |

| Withdrawn | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 72% (391) | 56% (171) |
| Infrequently—Not Controlled | 4% (21) | 6% (18) |
| Infrequently—Controlled | 10% (53) | 12% (35) |
| Frequently—Not Controlled | 10% (55) | 18% (55) |
| Frequently—Controlled | 5% (25) | 8% (25) |
| Total No. of Responses | 545 | 304 |
| Number of No Responses | 163 | 63 |

| Primary Communication Medium | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| None | 20% (123) | 36% (119) |
| Gestural | 6% (37) | 9% (30) |
| Oral | 35% (210) | 35% (116) |
| Braille | 14% (85) | 9% (30) |
| Print | 25% (148) | 12% (40) |
| Total No. of Responses | 603 | 335 |
| Number of No Responses | 105 | 32 |

| Status of Intelligence Measure | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| No Test Given (Can't be tested) | 5% (29) | 6% (21) |
| No Test Given (Could be tested) | 7% (40) | 6% (19) |
| Test Attempted—No Results | 15% (88) | 12% (39) |
| Individual Has Been Tested | 73% (424) | 76% (257) |
| Total No. of Responses | 581 | 336 |
| Number of No Responses | 127 | 31 |

| Results of Intelligence Measure | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Profound | 24% (122) | 41% (122) |
| Severe | 7% (37) | 13% (37) |
| Moderate | 7% (38) | 9% (27) |
| Mild | 8% (42) | 7% (22) |
| Boderline | 9% (48) | 7% (20) |
| Normal | 29% (146) | 16% (48) |
| Above Normal | 10% (51) | 4% (11) |
| Not Applicable | 1% (4) | 0% (1) |
| Information not available | 4% (22) | 2% (7) |
| Total No. of Responses | 510 | 295 |
| Number of No Responses | 2 | 1 |

| General Level of Academic Achievement | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Pre-School | 30% (175) | 49% (137) |
| Primary | 21% (122) | 22% (62) |
| Intermediate | 16% (95) | 13% (38) |
| Junior High | 9% (54) | 5% (13) |
| Senior High | 17% (97) | 10% (28) |
| Post-Secondary | 6% (36) | 1% ( (4) |
| Total No. of Responses | 579 | 282 |
| Number of No Responses | 129 | 85 |

| Dressing | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Independent | 65% (388) | 41% (138) |
| Partially Dependent | 15% (89) | 23% (75) |
| Totally Dependent | 20% (120) | 36% (120) |
| Total No. of Responses | 597 | 333 |
| Number of No Responses | 111 | 34 |

| Eating or Feeding | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Independent | 71% (433) | 51% (170) |
| Partially Dependent | 11% (68) | 18% (59) |
| Totally Dependent | 17% (106) | 32% (106) |
| Total No. of Responses | 607 | 335 |
| Number of No Responses | 101 | 32 |

| Toilet | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Independent | 71% (428) | 49% (162) |
| Partially Dependent | 11% (65) | 18% (60) |
| Totally Dependent | 18% (106) | 32% (106) |
| Total No. of Responses | 599 | 328 |
| Number of No Responses | 109 | 39 |

| Average Number of Hours per Week in Structured Education and/or Training Program | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| No Structured Program | 25% (138) | 34% (113) |
| 1–5 hours | 8% (42) | 9% (31) |
| 6–10 hours | 5% (27) | 8% (26) |
| 11–15 hours | 4% (23) | 5% (16) |
| 16–20 hours | 3% (14) | 4% (13) |
| 21–25 hours | 3% (15) | 4% (12) |
| 26–30 hours | 39% (216) | 24% (80) |
| 31–35 hours | 10% (53) | 7% (22) |
| 36–40 hours | 4% (20) | 3% (11) |
| 41 or more hours | 1% (5) | 2% (5) |
| Total No. of Responses | 553 | 329 |
| Number of No Responses | 155 | 38 |

| Type of Present Education Program | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| None | 19% (122) | 31% (107) |
| Home Program | 3% (16) | 3% (11) |
| Readiness | 9% (55) | 12% (43) |
| Academic | 52% (328) | 32% (110) |
| Sheltered Workshop | 3% (18) | 2% (8) |
| Vocational | 4% (28) | 5% (18) |
| Other | 11% (69) | 14% (50) |
| Total No. of Responses | 636 | 347 |
| Number of No Responses | 72 | 20 |

| Parents' or Guardian's Attitude toward Individual | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Overt Rejection | 3% (20) | 6% (20) |
| Disguised Rejection | 8% (48) | 12% (38) |
| Overprotective | 12% (68) | 14% (46) |
| Acceptance | 74% (433) | 63% (205) |
| Prefer Not to Answer | 3% (18) | 5% (16) |
| Total No. of Responses | 587 | 325 |
| Number of No Responses | 121 | 42 |

| Parents' or Guardian's Willingness to Accept Help from Agency when Needed | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Totally Rejects Help | 4% (23) | 6% (20) |
| Accepts Help when Coerced | 8% (49) | 11% (34) |
| Accepts Help when Prompted | 16% (94) | 15% (47) |
| Accepts Help when Offered | 35% (205) | 35% (110) |
| Seeks Help | 31% (178) | 27% (84) |
| Actively Seeks Help | 2% (12) | 3% (8) |
| Prefer Not to Answer | 3% (18) | 4% (13) |
| Total No. of Responses | 579 | 316 |
| Number of No Responses | 129 | 51 |

| Parents' or Guardian's Contact with Agency | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Rarely or Never | 17% (97) | 20% (66) |
| Infrequently | 40% (232) | 36% (118) |
| Frequently | 41% (238) | 41% (134) |
| Constantly | 0% (1) | 0% (1) |
| Prefer Not to Answer | 2% (14) | 3% (11) |
| Total No. of Responses | 582 | 330 |
| Number of No Responses | 126 | 37 |

| Is this person currently in the most appropriate training setting? | Total of Visually Impaired Population | Justified Institutionalization |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 86% (547) | 84% (288) |
| No–Should be in public school special education | 2% (10) | 1% (5) |
| No–Should be in residential setting for mentally retarded | 0% (3) | 1% (2) |
| No–Should be in residential setting for emotionally disturbed | 0% (1) | 0% (1) |
| No–Should be in residential setting for hearing impaired | 0% (0) | 0% (0) |
| No–Should be in residential setting for visually impaired | 2% (12) | 3% (9) |
| No–Should have special training at home | 0% (3) | 1% (3) |
| Uncertain | 9% (57) | 10% (33) |
| Total No. of Responses | 633 | 341 |
| Number of No Responses | 75 | 26 |